



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## THE SEE OF ST. PETER—No. V.

We now proceed to the scriptural arguments relied on by Roman Catholic controversialists as establishing the supremacy of the Pope, and, conceiving as we do, that the final reference of all religious questions must be to the written word of God, we think too much pains cannot be bestowed upon this part of our subject.

There are but three texts mainly relied on, but their importance cannot be overrated. If, when thoroughly considered and understood, those three texts, or any of them, do establish the supremacy of St. Peter, we admit it is no valid objection that they are few in number; because even a single distinct announcement of the Divine will is conclusive, and ought to overcome all objections. In proportion, however, to their fewness, such texts should be clear, as we cannot believe that God would have laid the foundation of the whole Christian edifice upon a few isolated passages of ambiguous character, when everything else necessary to salvation is written so plainly that he that runs may read it.

The first text relied on is the celebrated one, so unceasingly repeated by Roman Catholic writers, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," &c.—Matt., xvi., 18, 19.

We have no difficulty here as to correct translation, for the Douay and Authorized Protestant Bibles agree almost to the letter.

The whole passage is as follows. We give it verbatim from the Douay Bible:

13. "And Jesus came into the quarters of Cesarea Philippi: and He asked his disciples saying; whom do men say that the Son of man is?

14. But they said: Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets.

15. Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am?

16. Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.

17. And Jesus answering said to him: Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.

18. And I say to thee: That thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

19. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven.

20. Then he commanded his disciples, that they should tell no one that He was Jesus the Christ.

21. From that time Jesus began to show to his disciples, that He must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the ancients and scribes and chief priests, and be put to death, and the third day rise again.

22. And Peter taking Him, began to rebuke Him, saying: Lord, be it far from thee, this shall not be unto thee.

23. Who turning said to Peter, Go behind me, Satan, thou art a scandal unto me: because thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that are of men."

We need scarcely observe that the expressions used by our Lord in verses 18 and 19 of the above passage are highly figurative, and that to understand the true meaning of our Lord's discourse, we must take each part of it in order. He first speaks of the *foundation* on which the Church was to be built as a *rock*, and, secondly, of the *mode* by which an entrance into that Church was to be obtained, or by which that Church was to be governed—as the *keys* of the kingdom of heaven.

Let us consider them in the same order.

First—What was the *rock* of which our Lord here speaks as the foundation on which He was about to build his Church?

That it was our Lord's intention to base the whole fabric of his Church on any one *man*, however pre-eminent, we may observe, in the first place, would appear extremely improbable, as being inconsistent, in fact, with the whole current of Scripture. Jesus himself is always spoken of in Scripture as the *rock* and *foundation*. St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, says, "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ"—I. Cor., iii. 11. And, again, in referring to the old dispensation, "They drank of that spiritual rock, and that rock was Christ."—I. Cor., x. 4.

In an inferior and metonymic sense, doubtless, St. Peter might be considered as the foundation—as the agent or instrument by which the Church was founded; but, then, it would be equally inconsistent with other passages to treat him even in that sense as exclusively the foundation.

St. John, describing the heavenly Jerusalem, says, "The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb."\*

St. Paul also, writing to the Ephesians, reminds them that they are built (not on St. Peter, but) on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone.<sup>†</sup>

How, then, ought an honest inquirer after truth to interpret this passage?

The Council of Trent would tell us to consult the Fa-

thers, and interpret it according to their *unanimous consent*. And we must admit that this would be a reasonable thing to do, and even that it would be, perhaps, the safest guide, if *there were such unanimous consent*. Where all the Fathers of the Church agree as to an interpretation, we admit it would be in the highest degree improbable that they could possibly all be wrong; and if an unanimous consent of the Fathers might be expected in anything, surely it would be in a passage like this, which, if the Church of Rome be right, goes to the root of the whole matter of dispute, and is one of the principal pillars of the supreme authority of that Church which they maintain to have been founded on St. Peter, and to derive its powers from him.

Let us, then, turn to the Fathers, and see how the matter really stands. Are they all agreed that when our Lord said, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church," that He meant, *Peter is the rock on which my Church shall be built?*

We earnestly solicit the attention of our candid Roman Catholic readers (who, probably, have been always taught to believe that the Fathers are unanimous as to every part of the doctrine taught by their Church) to what follows.

So far is it from being the fact that *all* the Fathers, or even all the Popes themselves, hold such to be the meaning of the passage in question, that there is no passage in the Holy Scriptures on which there is so much difference of interpretation among them. There are, in fact, no less than four interpretations given by the ancient Fathers to this text.

Some passages in the Fathers do apply it, apparently, at least, to St. Peter *personally*, as the Church of Rome now asserts; others to the Apostles generally, *through* Peter, their head, who had just spoken *on their behalf*; a third class, and that by far the most numerous and important, including St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine, apply it to the faith which Peter had just confessed; while a fourth class apply it to Christ himself.

If we establish the truth of this statement, what becomes of the rule established by the Council of Trent, that Scripture shall be interpreted only according to the *unanimous consent* of the Fathers? And if this rule of interpretation proves to be so signally at fault with reference to this important text, and we can show that the Fathers do not agree among themselves as to the true meaning of such a passage as this, what becomes of the doctrine of the Church being an *infallible* interpreter of Scripture, and in what can we expect to find that *unanimous consent* which the Council of Trent points to as the only safe rule of interpretation?

We shall take our materials here exclusively from eminent Roman Catholic writers, and only regret that our space will not permit us fully to verify their statements by giving in *detail* all the passages to which they refer in proof of them.

The eminent ecclesiastical historian *Natalis Alexander*, vol. viii., pp. 376-7, points out what he calls this *fourfold* interpretation of the text in question, and details no less than thirty-five esteemed fathers and doctors of the Church who hold that the true interpretation is, that Christ would build his Church on the *faith* just *confessed* by Peter; not on the *person* of Peter, as distinguished from the rest of the Apostles.

We shall presently give a few specimens of these references.

Another very celebrated Roman Catholic writer, Father Launoy, goes still more elaborately into the matter, in his epistle to *Voellus*, in which he triumphantly exposes the uncandid and wilful misrepresentation of Cardinal Bellarmino, who most unfairly represented all the fathers as agreeing in the interpretation that the Church was built upon Peter alone.

Launoy gives seventeen extracts from the fathers, including passages from Origen, Cyprian, Cyril, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and others, in which St. Peter is spoken of as the *rock*; eight passages including the same Origen, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, and others, in which the Church is said to have been built upon *all* the Apostles; forty-four extracts, including passages from Hilary, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Eusebius, John Damascene, Pope Leo I., Felix III., Hormisdas, Gregory I., Hadrian I., Nicholas I., John VIII., and Stephen V., the Venerable Bede, and others, which treat the *faith which Peter confessed* as the *rock* on which the Church was built; and sixteen passages, including extracts from Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret, Bede, Anselm, Pope Celestine III., Pope Pius II., and St. Thomas Aquinas, which say that the Church was built on *Christ, the rock.*\*

As our object here is not to attempt to decide between so many conflicting opinions, but merely to show to demonstration that what is asserted by *Natalis Alexander* and Launoy is true, we shall not run the risk of wearying our readers by attempting to give all the passages to which they refer; but may observe, generally, that nearly all the passages of the 1st class are virtually neutralized, so far as they go to support the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome as the alleged successor of St. Peter, by showing that the very same fathers who are relied on to prove that Peter alone was the *rock* on which the Church was built, may be

also cited to prove that it was built *not* on Peter alone, but on *all* the Apostles.

Take the few following examples:—

"If," says Origen, "you think the whole Church to be built only on Peter alone, what will you say of John, the son of thunder, and of each of the Apostles?"

"Christ," says St. Jerome, "was the rock, and He bestowed it on the Apostles, that they should be called rocks."

Again, "You say that the Church is founded on Peter, but the same in another place is done upon *all* the Apostles."

"The Church," says St. Basil, "is built upon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles. Peter also was one of the mountains upon which rock the Lord did promise to build his Church."

By far, however, the most numerous and weighty authorities belong to the third class, among whom are St. Hilary, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Ambrose, St. Basil, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Cyril of Alexandria, and many others, including the following Popes—St. Gregory the Great, Adrian I., Felix III., Nicholas I., and John VIII., all of whom, so far from agreeing with the modern Church of Rome, unanimously agree with what Cardinal Bellarmino ventures to represent as peculiar to Luther and his followers, viz., that the *faith confessed by Peter*, not Peter himself, was the foundation on which, as on a rock, the Church was to be built.

We proceed to establish this assertion, even at the risk of being tedious, as we know nothing of greater importance in the whole controversy than an accurate knowledge of what these great Fathers wrote on this matter; for, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor observes, "Though all these witnesses concurring cannot make a proposition to be true, yet they are sufficient witnesses that it was not the universal belief of Christendom that the Church was built upon *St. Peter's person*."—*Liberty of Prophecying*, s. vii.

St. Hilary of Poitiers says, in writing on the Trinity, book 2—"This one *foundation*, therefore, is immovable; this alone is the happy *rock of faith*, confessed by the mouth of Peter, 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God.'

Again, "On this rock of the *confession* is the Church built. The natural senses of flesh and blood do not reveal the knowledge of this confession. This is the sacred gift of divine revelation, not merely to say, but to *believe*, Christ to be the Son of God. This *faith* is the *foundation* of the Church, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail; this *faith* has the keys of the heavenly kingdom, &c."

So St. Ambrose, "Faith is the *foundation* of the Church. For it is not said of the *body* but of the *faith* of Peter, that the gates of death shall not prevail over him. It is the *confession* that conquers hell," &c.

So St. Gregory of Nyssa says—"The Lord Jesus Christ is called the *rock* and the *rock of faith*; the rock of faith indeed, as the *foundation*, so that the Lord says to the chief of the Apostles, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church,' viz., on the *confession* of Christ, because he said, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.'

So St. Chrysostom writes on this passage—"I say unto you, thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church; that is, on the *faith thou hast confessed*."

So St. Cyril says, in his commentary on *Isaiah*—"Christ is the *foundation*. . . . in Him we are all built up a spiritual house, compacted together by the Spirit into a holy temple, the habitation of Himself; for He dwells in our hearts through faith. The Apostles and Evangelists may be considered also proximate and near foundations. . . . for by Himself (Christ) it was said to St. Peter (when he had just wisely and blamelessly confessed his faith in Him saying, 'Thou art Christ the son of the living God'), 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church'; calling, as I think, the *unshaken faith* of the disciple, the *rock.*"

\* Origen in *Matthew* xvi. p. 521, no. 11, tom. iii. Paris 1740, Ben. Edit.

† In *Amos*. lib. 3, p. 1135, Illemon. Oper. tom. iii. Paris, 1704, Ben. Ed.

"At die s. super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, si sit id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, &c."—Illemon. adv. Jovia, lib. 1. Oper. tom. iv., p. 162. Paris 1706.

§ Basil in *Isa.* ch. ii., tom. i., p. 427. Paris 1721, Ben. Ed.

"Unum igitur hoc est immobile fundamentum; una haec est fidelis petra, Petri ore confessio; Tu es Christus Filius Dei vivi."—Lib. 2, de *Trinitate*, p. 800; no. 23, Paris, 1793, Ben. Ed.

¶ Lib. 6, de *Trinitate*.—"Super hanc igitur confessionis petram Ecclesia edificatio est. Sed si unus carnis et sanguinis confessionis habuit intelligentiam non revelat. Hoc est divinis revelationis sacramentum, Christiani Dei Filium non sicut nuncupare, sed credere. Hae fides, Ecclesia est fundamentum, per haec fidem infirmes adversus eam sunt portae inferorum. Hae fides regit ea: stis habet clavis. Hae fides quae in terris solet agi, agaverit, et ligaverit, in eis sunt et solvit."—Idem, p. 903-4; no. 33, 37.

¶ Amb. de *Incar.* Dom. c. 5, Oper. tom. ii., p. 1086, Ben. Ed.

¶ Petra vita Domini et Deus iuster Jesus Christus dicitur, et Petra fidelis. . . . Petra quidem fidelis tanquam fundamentum, ut ipse Dominus ad principem (Apostolorum). Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram edificare Ecclesiam meam, super confessionem vero delicit Christi, quia dixisti. Tu es Christus."—Gregorii Nyssen, Oper. tom. ii., p. 162. Text. de adventu Domini in carne adversus Iudeos. Paris, 1638.

¶ "Kai έγω σοι λέγω συ ει Πέτρος και ιπι ταντυ τη Πέτρη δικαιομησω μη την έκκλησιαν ταντυστι τη πτώσεις της βρολογιας."—Chrysos. Oper. Graec. Savil, Tom. ii., p. 344. Homil. 54, in *Matth.* xvi., 18. Etonice, 1612. Ben. Ed., 1728, Tom. vii., p. 548.

¶ St. Cyril, Alex. in *Isaiah*, lib. iv., orat. 2, Tom. ii., p. 593 c. Lutet, 1638. (Auberts ed.) "Est enim omnium fundamentum et basis inconcussa Christus, qui omnia coeret ac continet, ut bene firma sint: in ipso enim omnes edificamur, domus spiritualis, compacti per spiritum

\* *Launoy Opera*, tom. v. p. ii., p. 93, Epist. vii. Lib. v., *Gu. Voellio*, Col. Allob., 1731.

\* *Apocal.*, xxi., 14.

† *Eph.*, ii., 20.

St. Epiphanius interprets it in the same way: "Because he (Peter) confessed that Christ was the Son of the living God, he heard in his turn, upon this rock of solid faith I will build my Church."

St. Augustine admits, in his Retractations, that he had himself given different interpretations to this passage. "I have spoken in a certain place of the Apostle Peter, that to him as on a rock the Church is built; but I very often have afterwards so expounded, that it should be understood of Him whom Peter confessed. For it was not said to him, 'Thou art the rock,' but 'Thou art Peter.' For the rock was Christ. But let the reader choose which of these two opinions is the more probable one."

One of these numerous passages, to which St. Augustine above refers, may be found in his treatise on the Gospel of St. John—"On this rock which you have confessed I will build my Church; for the rock was Christ, on which foundation Peter himself was also built. For no one can lay any foundation but that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ."

Another remarkable passage in St. Augustine may be found in his 13th Sermon on the words of our Lord, in which he says, "Christ was the Rock, Peter figuratively the Christian people . . . Therefore, He said 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church;' that is, I will build my Church on Myself, the Son of the living God. I will build thee on Myself; not Myself on thee. For men willing to build upon men said, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, that is Peter. But others who were unwilling to be built on Peter, but would be built upon the rock, said, But I am of Christ. But the Apostle Paul, when he knew that he was chosen and Christ contended, said, 'Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptised in the name of Paul? Wherefore as not in the name of Paul, so not in that of Peter; but in the name of Christ, that Peter may be built upon the rock, not the rock upon Peter.'

No one, after reading the foregoing extracts, can, we think, doubt what was the result of St. Augustine's mind upon this matter, and that it was ultimately unfavourable to the interpretation which the modern Church of Rome relies on as the only true one.

Theodore in 1 Corinthians iii. 11., expounding the Apostle's words: "For other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ," says, "It behoves us to build, not to destroy foundations; for he who wishes to build wisely, cannot lay any other foundation. This foundation the blessed Peter laid, or rather our Lord himself. For when Peter said, 'Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' the Lord said, 'On this rock I will build my Church.' Therefore, be ye not called by the name of men, for Christ is the foundation."

One question alone remains. Is it possible to reconcile

the *templo sanctum, in habitaculum ipsius: habitat enim in cordibus nostris per fidem. Fundamenta etiam proxima et viciniora nobis intelligi possunt, Apostoli et Evangelista . . . Ab ipso enim fiduciam est divino Petro, (quando sapienter et inculpate fidem in ipsius confessus est, dicens: Tu es Christus filius Dei viventis). Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam; petram, opinor, vocans, immotum fidem discipuli."*

*[Illyriay olupai leγyov tōv aκραδαγον εις πιτιν τα μαδητες.]*

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius heres. 59, sec. 7, lib. II. Tom. I. p. 503. Paris, Petav. 1622 Ed.—"Qui quidem solidae petre instar nobis extitit et velut fundamento Domini id est, supra quam Ecclesiam modis omnibus extrecta est. Imprimis quidem, quod Christum Dei vivi filium esse confessus est, idque vicissim audit, supra hanc solidae fidei petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam."

<sup>2</sup> St. Augustine, Retractations, lib. I. c. 21, Tom. I. p. 32. Ben. Ed. 1679—"In diu in quodam loco ab Apostolo Petro, quod in eo tanquam in petra fundata sit Ecclesia . . . Sed scio me postea sepius sine dicto exposuisse, ut supra hunc intellegatur quem confessus est Petrus. Non enim dictum est illi: Tu es petra, sed tu es Petrus Petrus autem erat Christus. Harum autem dñarum sententiarum quae sit probabilis, eligat lector."

<sup>3</sup> St. Augustine, Tract 124, seu ult. in Evangel. Johanni, Tom. 3, p. 2, p. 822. Ben. Ed.—"Cujus Ecclesiae Petrus Apostolus propter Apostolatus sui primatum regi figura generalitate personam . . . sed quando dicum te, tibi dabo claves regni celorum, &c. universum significabat ecclesiam que in hoc seculo diversis tentationibus, velut imbris, fluminibus, temperatibusque, quantitat, et non cadit; quoniam fundata est super petram, unde Petrus nomen accepit; non enim a Petro petra, sed Petrus a petra, sicut non Christus a Christiano, sed Christianus a Christo vocatur: ideo quippe ait Dominus super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam; quia dixerit Petrus, Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi. Supor hanc ergo (inquit) petram quam confessus es, edificabo Ecclesiam meam. Petra enim erat Christus super quod fundam nunti et ipse adiudicatus est Petrus. Fundamentum, quippe aliud nemo potest ponere pridem id quod positum est, quod est Christus Iesus."

<sup>4</sup> "Hoc autem ei nomen ut Petrus appellaretur, a Domino impossum est; et hoc in ea figura ut significaret Ecclesiam. Quia enim Christianus petra, Petrus populus Christianus. Petra enim principale nomen est. Ideo Petrus a petra, non petra a Petro; quomodo non a Christiano Christus, sed a Christo Christianus vocatur. Tu es ergo, inquit, Petrus, et super hanc petram quam confessus, super hanc petram quam cognovisti, dicens: Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi, edificabo Ecclesiam meam: id est, super me ipsum Filium Dei vivi, edificabo Ecclesiam meam. Super me adiudicato est; non me super te."

<sup>5</sup> "Nam valentes homines edificari super homines dicebant, ego quidem sum Pauli, ego autem Apollo, ego vero Cephas, ipse autem Petrus. Et ali qui nolentem edificari super Petrum sed super petram, ego autem sum Christi. Apostolus autem Paulus ubi cognovit se eligi et Christianum contempsit: Divisa est, inquit, Christus? Numquid Paulus pro vobis crucifixus est? Aut in nomine Pauli baptizati sunt? Quomodo non in Pauli, sic nec in Petri; sed in nomine Christi, ut Petrus edificaret super petram, non petra super Petrum?"—Sermo lxxv. Serm. 13, de verbis Domini, cap. 1, sectione 1. Opera. Tom. V. p. 415.

<sup>6</sup> "Opote adiudicare, non fundamenta destruere. Neque enim nullus potest jacerre fundamenta, qui vult sapienter sed fieri. Hoc fundamentum jecit: beatus Petrus, vel petrus ipse Dominus. Cum enim iudicaret Petrus, Tu es Christus filius Dei ei, dixit Dominus: super hanc petram edificabo Ecclesiam meam. Ne vix ergo denominare ab Aquiniano, Christus enim est fundamentum."—Theod. Oper., tom. 3, p. 133. Paris, 1642.

all these great authorities with the others above referred to as relied on by the Church of Rome? For though we as Protestants rely on the Scriptures alone, we think it a matter of great interest to show that the great doctors of the Church are not really at issue among themselves, when treating of the Scriptures they so much revered.

On one theory, viz., that of the modern Church of Rome, it is impossible; on the other, that of the Church of England, it is easy. The differences, in fact, as has been well observed by an able modern writer, are more apparent than real. "For whether we speak of the act of confession, or the faith confessed, or of Christ, who is the supreme object, or of the principle subjectively considered, either in the body of the Apostles, or in Peter, as representing them, the prevailing idea is one and the same. It makes, however, a very important difference whether Peter is spoken of as the type of a principle common to his colleagues and to all Christians, or whether he is considered as pre-eminent on account of a gift peculiar to himself: the former is what the primitive writers really affirm; the latter is the gloss which Romanists are anxious to put upon their statements."

What we require is, the production of some clear primitive testimony, that by the application of this text personally to St. Peter his supreme power over the whole Church was understood; but for that we have searched in vain, and we think we may confidently assert that nothing of this kind is to be found.

We now proceed to the other branch of the passage, (v. 19) in which our Blessed Lord says: "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in the heavens, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed in the heavens."

That the power here promised was identical with that afterwards actually given to all the Apostles, we have already shown in a former article; but the same thing will, in fact, appear clearly to any candid inquirer upon merely reading the passages in St. Matthew xviii. 18 John xx. 23.

St. Matthew xviii. 18:—"Amen, I say to you (i.e., to the disciples whom he was addressing), whatsoever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven."

John xx. 22-23—"When he had said this, he breathed on them, and said to them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."—(Douny Bible.)

In order to try to evade this consequence, some writers have attempted an ill-founded and over subtle distinction between the power of the keys and that of binding and loosing; but even Cardinal Bellarmine, anxious as he was to maintain the Papal power at the highest point, admits that such a distinction is unfounded, and that they are really identical ("ut omnino sit item solvere et aperire, claudere et ligare").

The Fathers are also express upon this subject.

St. Jerome says in express words that "all the Apostles did receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

So Theophylact—"Although it be spoken to Peter alone, I will give thee; yet it is given to all the Apostles."

So also Ambrose—"I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that you may bind and loose; what is said to Peter, is said to the Apostles."

Also Origen—"Are the keys of the kingdom of Heaven given by the Lord to Peter alone, and shall none other of the blessed ones receive them? But, if this, I will give the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, be common; how also are not all the things common, which were spoken before, or are added as spoken to Peter?"

So the learned Rigalt in his commentary on the epistles of Firmilian, says—"He said to Peter, I will give thee the keys; but he said not, I will give them to *thee alone*."

St. Chrysostom makes it part of the character of St. John—"He that hath the keys of the Heavens."

St. Augustine explains and reconciles all the passages by holding that what was promised to Peter, and afterwards given to all the rest of the Apostles, was spoken to Peter in a representative capacity on behalf of them all. "Peter," says he, "in many places in the Scriptures, appears as representing the Church, but especially where it is said to him, 'I will give you the keys.' Has Peter received these keys, and has not Paul received them?"

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. Saunderson Robins on the evidence of Scripture against the claims of the Roman Church. London; Longman and Co., 1853.

<sup>2</sup> CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. II. p. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Bellarmine de Rom. Pont. lib. I. c. 12 p. 522, c. P. 1608.

<sup>4</sup> Hier. Advers. lib. I. Tom. IV. part. II. p. 164. Paris, 1706. Ben. ed. "Lest id ipsius in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, ut cuncti claves regni eorum recipiant."

<sup>5</sup> *Ei γαρ και πρός Πέτρον μόνον είρηται το, δύωσι ποι, δλλά και πάσι τοις Ἀπεστόλοις δέδοται.*—Theophyl.

in loco.—Tom. I. p. 85. Venet. 1754.

<sup>6</sup> *Tibi dabo claves regni eorum, ut et servis et Nigis. Quod Petro dicitur, Apostolus dicitur.—Ambrose in Psalms xxxviii. last verse.*

<sup>7</sup> *Origin in Matt. xii. Tom. XII. no. 11. Oper. Tom. 3. p. 525.*

<sup>8</sup> *Paris, 1740. Ben. ed.*

<sup>9</sup> *Dixit Petrus, dabo tibi claves, at non dixit, Dabo tibi ποι.*—Rival. Observations in Epst. Cyprian. Epis. 75, p. 148. Paris 1648.

<sup>10</sup> *O rάς ελείς ξών τον οὐρανον.*—Chrysost. in Evang. John. Hom. I. p. 2. Oper. Tom. 8. Paris, 1728. Ben. ed.

Peter received them, and not James and John, and the rest of the Apostles?"

Passages to the same effect might easily be multiplied; but these already given are, we think, enough to satisfy any impartial mind that if the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven do impart supreme power, then each Apostle had supreme power, and St. Peter had no supremacy over the rest of the Apostles, which he could hand down to his successors, supposing it were as clearly established as we have already proved it is not, that the Bishops of Rome are entitled exclusively to that title.

Any one who will consult the proceedings of the Council of Paris in the 8th century, or even those of the Council of Constance, or Council of Basle, in the 15th century, will see how little unanimity exists among Roman Catholics themselves in confining the giving of the keys to the successors of St. Peter, and how large and important a part of those in external communion with the Church of Rome for many centuries claim for all bishops the power of binding and loosing, as flowing to them directly from Christ, without any reference to the successors of St. Peter, even admitting the Pope to be such successor.

The learned Roman Catholic historian, Dupin, goes even farther; for he affirms that "the Fathers are unanimous in assigning ecclesiastical power, either to the Church generally, or to the Apostles, and after them to Bishops; that there is not one to be found who holds it to have been given to Peter and his successors alone; that they have guarded against any wrong inference that might be drawn from the promise given to Peter, by showing that he was regarded merely as the representative of the Church." He says that "the number of passages that might be cited on the subject is infinite; that, in fact, there is scarcely an ecclesiastical writer who would not furnish one."

If anything were wanting to show that our Lord did not intend to confer any personal pre-eminence upon St. Peter over the rest of the Apostles in this passage, we think the severe rebuke administered to him in the 23rd verse, following so close upon his confession, would supply it. We cannot, indeed, look upon this rebuke, "Get thee behind me, Satan," as other than a providential guard and warning against deducing, from the previous blessing promised on his prompt confession, any such unwarrantable conclusion as has just been attempted to be drawn from it by ultramontane divines.

Having occupied so much (but, we trust, not too much) space in considering this often quoted portion of Scripture, which, but for the zeal with which men will always defend a position once taken up, we might well be surprised should have been so confidently relied on in support of the Papal Supremacy, we must reserve the consideration of the remaining texts, Luke xxii. 32; and John xxi. 15-17, until our succeeding number.

#### THE DUMB VILLAGE.

CHAP. V.

THE scene which Tom Connell dreaded was now over. But, though so far relieved and light of heart, a painful and disturbing impression had been left by it upon his mind. That some deep mental inquietude had wasted Father M.'s cheek, and produced unusual agitation and nervousness of manner, was quite apparent. Tom was, however, too keen to set this wholly down to the state of things in the village, or to rumours of his own disaffection. The root of the matter, it was plain, went deeper, though where it lay passed his philosophy to explain. Of the conflict in the good priest's mind he was, of course, wholly ignorant; and, entirely unsuspecting of the circumstances which gave it its peculiar character to the recent interview, he was quite puzzled to account for it. Expecting strong rebuke, he had met with a tenderness of address which both surprised and touched him. It was, in fact, the gentle and softened manner of Father M. which had encouraged him to speak so unreservedly. The scene itself was altogether so different from his fears and anticipations, that, though feeling much more at ease when it was over, the faithful fellow's heart began to bleed, as he walked slowly away, under the conviction that a secret sorrow was preying upon the heart of his dear friend, which he would be unable to soothe, because he could not comprehend it.

Tom's affectionate thoughts soon began to work busily.

"Sure enough," he muttered, "he has been looking very drowsy this long time, but I never thought as much as I ought about it. What can be the matter with him, I wonder? I used to think he would be fretting about the Scripture-readers and myself; but it's something beyond that, or he wouldn't be so kind and humble like, nor let me go on as I did. I have it!" said he at last, smiting his thigh with great and startling energy—"I have it, as

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Sermo. 149. Tom. II. p. 706—"Petrus in multis locis scriptum apparuit quod personam gestat Ecclesiae, maxime in illo ubi dicitur est, Tibi dabo claves. Nunquid istas claves Petrus accepit, et Paulus non accepit? Petrus accepit, et Johannes et Jacobus non accepit, et easteri Apololi?" Father Lannoy cites twenty-six passages to the same effect from St. Augustine. Epist. Lib. II. Ep. 5. p. 218, &c.

<sup>2</sup> "On n'en trouvera pas un qui ait avancé que cette puissance soit donnée à S. Pierre et ses successeurs seuls, afin qu'il ait communication avec l'église: au contraire, on en verra plusieurs qui craignent qu'on ne titille cette faute et conséquence de la promesse que Jesus Christ a faite à S. Pierre de lui donner les clés de l'église, remarquant que S. Pierre représente l'église en cette rencontre, et que ce n'est pas l'église à qui Jesus Christ les a promises en la personne de S. Pierre. On pourra appeler un nombre infini de passages sur ce sujet. Il n'y a presque point d'autour ecclésiastique qui n'ait fourni quelque chose."—Dupin in Traité de l'autorité Ecclés. Tom. II. p. 16.